



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,134	12/27/2000	David Moyers	088305/0134	3310

7590

05/31/2006

William T. Ellis
FOLEY & LARDNER
Washington Harbour
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, DC 20007-5109

EXAMINER

NGUYEN BA, PAUL H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/748,134	MOYERS, DAVID	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paul Nguyen-Ba	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This action is responsive to Applicant's Arguments filed on 3/2/2006.
2. Claims 1-9 are currently pending. Claims 1, 8, and 9 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-4 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayyadurai, U.S. Patent No. 6,718,368, in view of Barrus et al. ("Barrus"), U.S. Patent No. 6,784,899, in further view of Posner, U.S. Patent Publication Application No. 2003/0208434, in further view of Microsoft® Outlook 2000 ("Outlook"), © 1994-1999 Microsoft Corp.**

Regarding independent claim 1, Ayyadurai teaches a method, system, and computer program for processing an inbound transaction document sent by a customer

to a user in an electronic commerce system (see Abstract), the method comprising the steps of:

➤ *receiving the inbound document at an interface for communication with trading partners* (Figs. 1 and 2 - (5) → Ayyadurai teaches an E-mail Viewer and Editor interface to receive an inbound document.);

➤ *routing the inbound document to a mailbox of the user* (Fig. 3 - (3); col. 5, lines 44-48 → Ayyadurai teaches an E-mail Routing System for content sensitive automatic reply message generation.);

➤ *automatically determining a set of candidate reply transaction documents associated with the inbound document and the particular trading partner that sent the inbound document* (Fig. 3 - (91); col. 6, lines 15-24 et seq. → Ayyadurai teaches that based upon the determining parsing tags, the automatic reply generator retrieves from a library of phrases the candidate reply documents that are appropriate.);

➤ *parsing the inbound document to determine transaction data relevant to the selected reply document* (Fig. 3 - (30) and Fig. 4; col. 5, lines 60-67 et seq. → Ayyadurai teaches that a filter and modeler performs language analysis and characterization of the content of the inbound document.);

➤ *generating a user edit screen displaying the automatically-populated selected transaction reply document, receiving a user input of additional transaction data, and writing said additional data to the reply document* (Fig. 3 -

(33), (34); Fig. 4; col. 5, lines 31-33; col. 7, lines 32-58 → Ayyadurai teaches generating a user edit screen.); and

➤ *transmitting the reply document* (col. 7, lines 59-61; Fig. 3 – (39) → Ayyadurai teaches transmitting an electronic reply).

Ayyadurai does not specifically teach *without performing a language analysis of a content of the inbound document*.

However, Barrus teaches a method/system maintains various user profiles and provides for the automatic delivery of reply messages appropriate to user's profile (i.e. e-mail) without performing a language analysis of a content of the inbound document (see col. 22 lines 39-57).

Since Ayyadurai and Barrus are both from the same field of endeavor (i.e. electronic message reply systems), the motivational purpose of an improved and faster electronic message reply method/system as disclosed by Barrus would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Ayyadurai.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Ayyadurai with the teachings of Barrus to include "without performing a language analysis of a content of the inbound document".

Ayyadurai-Barrus do not specifically teach *displaying a link to each candidate reply transaction document of said set adjacent to a header of the inbound document in a screen of a mailbox application for the user.*

However, Outlook teaches displaying a link to each attachment candidate document of an attachment set adjacent to a header of inbound document in a screen of a mailbox application for the user (see screenshot) for the purpose of providing a quick, user-friendly graphical user interface for the selection of documents from a set of said documents.

Since Ayyadurai-Barrus and Outlook are both from the same field of endeavor, the purposes disclosed by Outlook would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Ayyadurai-Barrus. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Ayyadurai-Barrus with the teachings of Outlook to include *displaying a link to each candidate reply transaction document of said set adjacent to a header of the inbound document in a screen of a mailbox application for the user* for the motivational purpose of providing a quick, user-friendly graphical user interface for the selection of documents from a set of said documents.

Ayyadurai-Barrus-Outlook do not specifically teach *receiving a user selection of a reply transaction document from said candidate set and automatically populating the selected reply document with said transaction data.*

However, Posner teaches the creation of a purchase order wherein the purchasing agent accesses a template manager module to select at least one type of purchase order from a set which is then automatically populated with information included in the RFP (pg. 4 [0050]- 0056)) for the purpose of optimal workflow and collaboration capabilities in an on-line environment.

Since Ayyadurai-Barrus-Outlook and Posner are from the same field of endeavor, the purposes disclosed by Posner would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Ayyadurai-Barrus-Outlook. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Ayyadurai-Barrus-Outlook with the teachings of Posner to include *receiving a user selection of a reply transaction document from said candidate set and automatically populating the selected reply document with said transaction data* for the motivational purpose of optimal workflow and collaboration capabilities in an on-line environment.

Independent claims 8 and 9 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as independent claim 1 and are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 2, Ayyadurai teaches a method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the system *determines the set of candidate reply transaction documents by performing a look-up to a database indexed with the inbound document sender and addressee and the inbound document type* (col. 5, lines 56 et seq. → Ayyadurai teaches that inbound

documents are stored in an ODBC interface for interaction with the "Filter and Modeler" that determines the set of candidate reply transaction documents).

Regarding claim 3, Ayyadurai teaches a method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the system determines the set of candidate reply transaction documents by operation of a translation engine, but does not specifically teach *checking the inbound documents for compliance with a standard model, sending a negative functional acknowledgement to the trading customer or rejecting the inbound document if the compliance check is negative*.

However, it was commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art that EDI systems and Electronic Mail systems routinely check inbound documents for compliance with a standard model and either rejects the inbound document or notifies the sender of an error in compliance for the purpose of allowing the sender to correct the inbound document to comply with the standard model for subsequent transmittal.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include *checking the inbound documents for compliance with a standard model, sending a negative functional acknowledgement to the trading customer or rejecting the inbound document if the compliance check is negative* for the purpose of allowing the sender to correct the inbound document to comply with the standard model for subsequent transmittal.

Regarding claim 4, Ayyadurai teaches a method as claimed in claim 1, wherein *the inbound document is parsed by a translation engine of the system translating the inbound document into a pre-populated selected reply document* (Fig. 3 – (30); col. 5, lines 60-67 *et seq.*; Fig. 3 – (91); col. 6, lines 15-24 *et seq.* → Ayyadurai teaches a “Filter and Modeler” working in conjunction with the “Automatic Reply Composer”).

Regarding claims 6 and 7, Ayyadurai teaches a method as claimed in claim 1, wherein *the additional data is inputted to the system with use of a tool for appending data to field and for replacing automatically populated data* ((Fig. 3 – (33), (34); Fig. 4; col. 5, lines 31-33; col. 7, lines 32-58 → Ayyadurai teaches a Reply Control Panel).

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayyadurai, U.S. Patent No. 6,718,368, in view of Kennedy et al. (“Kennedy”), U.S. Patent No. 6,651,217.

Regarding claim 5, Ayyadurai teaches the method with respect to claim 4 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach *a pre-populated HTML reply document for rendering within a browser*.

However, Kennedy teaches a method for populating a plurality of fields appearing on a form such as an HTML-based form rendered on a browser (see

Abstract) for the purpose of computer-implemented processing of data-entry forms, such as HTML-generated forms on Internet web pages (col. 1, lines 7-9).

Since Ayyadurai and Kennedy are both from the same field of endeavor, the purposes disclosed by Kennedy would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Ayyadurai. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Ayyadurai with the teachings of Kennedy to include a method for *populating a plurality of fields appearing on a form such as an HTML-based form rendered on a browser* for the purpose of computer-implemented processing of data-entry forms, such as HTML-generated forms on Internet web pages.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims filed on 3/2/2006 have been fully considered, but are not considered persuasive.

Applicant first contends that Examiner acknowledged that the primary reference, Ayyadurai, does not disclose the feature of "automatically determining a set of candidate reply transaction associated with the inbound document and the particular trading partner without performing a language analysis of the content of the inbound document". Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner first directs Applicant's attention to the fact that the primary Ayyadurai reference teaches "automatically determining a set of candidate reply transactions" (Fig. 3 – (91); col. 6, lines 15-24 *et seq.*). Ayyadurai teaches that based upon the determining parsing tags, the automatic reply generator retrieves from a library of phrases the candidate reply documents that are appropriate. The Barrus reference, therefore, was added to only teach the limitation "without performing a language analysis of the content of the inbound document". Barrus teaches a method/system maintains various user profiles and provides for the automatic delivery of reply messages appropriate to user's profile (i.e. e-mail) without performing a language analysis of a content of the inbound document (see col. 22 lines 39-57).

Since Ayyadurai and Barrus are both from the same field of endeavor (i.e. electronic message reply systems), the motivational purpose of an improved and faster electronic message reply method/system as disclosed by Barrus would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Ayyadurai. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Ayyadurai with the teachings of Barrus to include "without performing a language analysis of a content of the inbound document".

Applicant then contends that the cited prior art of record, Barrus, does not disclose "automatically determining a set of candidate reply transactions without performing a language analysis of the content of the inbound document". Examiner respectfully disagrees.

However, Examiner reiterates that the primary Ayyadurai reference teaches “automatically determining a set of candidate reply transactions” (Fig. 3 – (91); col. 6, lines 15-24 *et seq.*). Ayyadurai teaches that based upon the determining parsing tags, the automatic reply generator retrieves from a library of phrases the candidate reply documents that are appropriate. The Barrus reference, therefore, was added to only teach the limitation “without performing a language analysis of the content of the inbound document” as discussed in the rejection of independent claim 1 above.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Nguyen-Ba whose telephone number is (571) 272-4094. The examiner can normally be reached on 11 am - 7 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PNB
3/23/06


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100